

SN. 10/772,968

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FUJI:292

REMARKS

Applicant notes the examiner has indicated claims 7-11 are allowed.

The examiner has objected to the title. Applicant has provided a new title in view of the examiner's comments. Approval of the new title is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-16 were objected to due to a grammatical error. Applicant has amended claim 12 to delete the term "means" as proposed by the examiner. The amendment to the claim should not be interpreted as limiting the scope of the claim or equivalents entitled thereto. The amendment to claim 12 is believed to place claims 12-16 in condition for allowance, as the examiner indicated the claims were allowable once the objection was overcome.

Claims 18-23 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. Applicant has rewritten claim 18 as an independent claim. The amendment to the claim should not be interpreted as limiting the scope of the claim or equivalents entitled thereto. Claims 19-23 depend either directly or indirectly on claim 18. Accordingly, claims 18-23 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-6 were also objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. Applicant has not amended the claims to place them in independent form. Instead, applicant will traverse the rejection of claim 1 on which the claims depend.

Claims 1 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Daun-Lindburg et al. in view of Davila. The examiner states that Daun-Lindburg et al. discloses all of the elements of the claims at issue with the exception of a rectified AC power source. Davila is cited to support the argument it would be obvious to provide a rectified AC power source in the device of Daun-Lindburg et al. to arrive at the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Even if the combination of references proposed by the examiner were correct, the combination could not yield the claimed invention. Neither reference discloses or suggests the use of a means for outputting an error amplified signal for setting a DC current output from the rectifying and smoothing means to a predetermined value and a control device that alternately turns ON and OFF the first and second switching elements based on the error amplified signal and an input voltage from the AC power source.

As neither of the cited references discloses the claimed means for outputting an error amplified signal and a control means that utilizes that signal to control switching, the reference cannot form the basis for finding the claims prima facie obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103. The rejection is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

SN. 10/772,968

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FUJI:292

Claims 2-6 depend on claim 1 either directly or indirectly. Accordingly, claims 2-6 should also be in condition for allowance.


Applicant has added new claims 24 and 25 to further claim the features of the disclosed invention. Neither reference discloses or suggests the features of claims 24 or 25 either singly or in combination.

In view of the above, all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance, notice of which is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

05-21-06
DATE


MARC A. ROSSI
REG. NO. 31,923

P.O. Box 826
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)